

## REMARKS

### Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 is rejected over Gundlach. This rejection is in error, because Gundlach fails to disclose or suggest several limitations of claim 1. These include: adhering a module component to a substrate with an **adhesive that can be ablated by light**, and then **ablating the adhesive** by illuminating it. The purpose is to **remove the module from the substrate** in order to **allow reuse of the substrate**.

Gundlach, in contrast, lacks all of these features. Specifically, Gundlach suggests neither an **adhesive that can be ablated** by light as claimed, nor the step of **ablating** an adhesive as claimed. Gundlach's modules are not **removed** from the substrate as claimed, but instead permanently attached. Nor does Gundlach suggest allowing **reuse** of the carrier substrate as claimed.

Therefore, on several grounds, claim 1 is patentable over the cited prior art.

### Dependent Claims 2-31

The remaining claims all depend from claim 1, which is patentable over the cited prior art as explained above. The limitations that the dependent claims add to claim 1 distinguish them further from the prior art. Therefore, the dependent claims, also, are patentable.

The application is therefore now in condition for allowance, and allowance is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

*Mitchell Rose*

Mitchell Rose (Reg. No. 47,906)  
JONES DAY  
901 Lakeside Ave.  
Cleveland, OH 44114  
(216)586-7094

Date: 10/10/07